



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

herself freely, she insisted upon independence—a cottage of her own, a recognized position in the community. These conditions are obviously essential. Having them, Mrs. Harvey wrought a miracle; and the most striking fact about her achievement is, as Miss Dewey points out, that “it has been accomplished with no greater resources than are available in any isolated district.” The lesson is plain. “What we need is not a certain system, nor a lot of new methods and equipment, but a direction, a conscious purpose toward which the schools shall strive.” The purpose, be it noted, is not to be merely a phase of communal enthusiasm (Germany had communal enthusiasm) but a broadly self-respecting—that is, a fundamentally unselfish purpose.

Such is the lesson, but how are we to apply it? It is the old, old question of how to make moral energy work and spread. We cannot get better schools merely by legislative enactment. We cannot get them merely by paying rural teachers better wages. We cannot get them merely by teaching improved methods. “The theoretical training given in normal schools to-day all points,” says Miss Dewey, “to the value of such teaching as Mrs. Harvey’s.” Mrs. Harvey’s teaching is up-to-date, intelligent, above all suited to the particular needs and interests of her pupils, but it is not revolutionary. The fundamental question, then is not so much how to teach as how to get a Mrs. Harvey to do the teaching.

Is not here, one may suggest, exactly the sort of sociological problem which the churches, without involving themselves in speculative sociology, could help to solve? There are plenty of serious-minded girls in America; they may be found doing all sorts of work—some of it unsatisfying enough, however well-paid. Ministers are commendably active in sending young people to college and out into the mission fields. Couldn’t ministers—or, better, the whole church community—exercise a valuable influence by directing the right sort of young folks toward a career of splendid usefulness in the rural field? College or normal school probably would have to come first; but after that the church would have a practical and idealistic answer to the aching question, “What next?”—an answer that would doubtless fit many cases.

Miss Dewey’s account of Mrs. Harvey’s work is as fascinating as an old-fashioned fairy-tale: everything comes out so much better than one’s hopeful interest dares to predict. In the beginning Mrs. Harvey encountered unbelievable prejudice; in the end she obtained wonderfully hearty coöperation. Miss Dewey’s book ought to be in every public library, in every school library, in every Sunday-school library. It ought to be talked about wherever young people may hear about it and be impressed by it. It ought to be on the moving picture screens.

PRUSSIANISM AND PACIFISM. By Poultney Bigelow. New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons.

The story of Prussianism as related by Mr. Bigelow is a singularly consistent narrative of intrigue, ambition, evil will. “The violation of Belgian neutrality by Wilhelm II., in 1914, stands as a landmark in criminology, but it is inseparably linked with that pleasant day in September of 1862 when the grandfather of Wilhelm II. gave one of many

instances where treaties have been but scraps of paper—in Hohenzollern eyes.” When Wilhelm I., at the instance of Bismarck decided to abolish the constitution, a step was taken in the direction of Armageddon. History is continuous. “This war,” writes Mr. Bigelow with his customary pungency, “is but one of a chain of wars that commenced when the first German saw that his neighbor had something.”

The story is told with great freshness and vigor. It speaks out the truth, as one man saw it and felt it, in a manner not common in histories. Especially striking are the authors’ estimates of men and the vision he gives of German system and German directness of purpose. Mr. Bigelow writes as one who has lived in the atmosphere or under the shadow of such personalities as Bismarck, Moltke, Wilhelm II.; and concerning them he gives us the results not only of logical judgment, but of moral insight. He makes us see that America might have learned from Germany in 1870 the meaning of preparedness. “In the summer of 1870, Moltke received word that his King had declared war on France. ‘Very well—open draw X. Y. Z. and you will find the French frontier—the orders are all made out—see that they are delivered. Good day!’ and the head of the general staff turned over and finished his nap.” It is an old lesson and a good one: the Devil is never lazy or unprepared. But it is a hard lesson for some to learn: in 1917 Americans were authoritatively assured that if this country were invaded a million well-armed soldiers would spring from the ground and chase the enemy into the sea!

Throughout the narrative, a reasonable and wholesome stress is laid upon the effect of individual thought and action. Washington and Cavour are contrasted with the Iago-like Bismarck; Frederick the Noble, under whose leadership Germany might conceivably have attained moral greatness, with the megalomaniac Wilhelm II. Character, good or bad, weak or strong, is a force at least as potent as economic causation, and not nearly so well understood as questions of wealth and population. Bismarck willed that Wilhelm I. should not abdicate; Queen Victoria willed that England should not interfere to prevent the spoliation of Denmark; the Empress Eugénie willed that France should go to war with Germany—in such things there is an unaccountable element that should put us on our guard against hasty generalization.

And the moral of it all is that we cannot safely depart from the good old dualistic and individualistic view of human life—from the belief that the good man should “trust in God and keep his powder dry.” We must not put all our faith in laws or leagues, or luck; in treaties or in general “progress.” We must not uncritically adopt a pleasant theory about human nature. “Let us honor the peacemakers,” writes Mr. Bigelow; “let us labor for brotherhood amongst nations; let us rear churches to him who preached upon the Mount of Olives, and let us even believe that man is improving in some respects, if not in all. But the man who loves his country should feel that the first duty of Government is to make that country safe from attack.”

History, of course, does not prove that the human race has made no progress. It does not demonstrate that universal peace is an impossibility—who does not believe that sooner or later this ideal will be

realized? But it does furnish a most ironic commentary upon pacifism—which is the mistaking of an ideal for a reality. The irony of the rise of Prussianism, as a commentary upon pacifism, Mr. Bigelow very tellingly expresses.

THE OLD FREEDOM. By Francis Neilson. New York: B. W. Huebsch.

Drawing largely upon English history for facts, quoting liberally from the histories of Stubbs, Freeman, and Green, and even from Taine's justly celebrated *History of English Literature*, Mr. Neilson seeks to establish the thesis that the salvation of society depends upon an immediate return to first principles—principles long ignored and now almost forgotten. "While science," he declares, "must go always forward, adding to its data and developing its process, in politics the tendency must be backward, back to true democracy."

To the support of this contention, the recent philosophical thinkers, as well as the somewhat less up-to-date historians are made to contribute. "There are three men in particular who have revealed to us in recent years the probability of a new era, or rather the return to the best of an old era." These men are Henri Bergson, Franz Oppenheimer, and Dr. Nicolai, author of *The Biology of War*. Bergson "has swept away all the lumber of the latter-day Spencer." In the light of his philosophy, it would appear, one may perceive that the report of the Whitley Commission, with its suggestion of a cautious evolution toward industrial democracy, is simply a piece of weak, old-fashioned, evolutionary policy. It looks to a slow, forward movement, whereas the true progress should be both backward and sudden. Franz Oppenheimer, holding a high position as an economist in the University of Berlin, has written "undoubtedly the most learned, the most thorough analytical treatise of the growth of the State," and has "revealed a desire to return to first principles." As for Dr. Nicolai, he has shown on biological principles the folly of German State Socialism and of German militarism, and he has preached a philosophy eminently sane and sound—except that its only basis is biology.

What is the proposition to which this rather oddly assorted list of thinkers are made—perhaps unwittingly—to lend their support, either as opponents of socialism or as advocates of first principles? In about seven pages at the end of his book, Mr. Neilson reveals the secret: the way of social and political salvation lies through the taxation of the full monopoly value of land.

The proposition that the state should take monopoly values, giving community-created values to the community and to the individual the full value of his product, is not wholly new. In fact, it has been a good deal discussed. One realizes, of course, that quite a strong case can be made out for it. But surely it has never before been advocated in just this way.

TWELVE MEN. By Theodore Dreiser. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Certain readers who care more for literature than for realism